

REMARKS

Reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims, in view of the forgoing amendments and the following remarks, are respectfully requested.

Prior to this Amendment, claims 1-30 were pending. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 8-9, 16, 20-21 and 23-24 are amended. Claims 4 and 7 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Claims 2, 5-7, 10-19, 22 and 25-30 remain unchanged. Accordingly, after entry of this Amendment, claims 1-3, 5-6 and 8-30 will remain pending.

In the Office Action, claim 28 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 1, 3, 5-10 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Meiki Co. Ltd (JP 2001-129864; hereafter "Meiki"). Claims 2, 11-19, 21-23 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Meiki in view of Toshiba Machine Co. Ltd (JP 2001-145947; hereafter "Toshiba"). Claims 4, 20, 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Meiki in view of Fogle et al. (US 2003/0074590; hereafter "Fogle"). Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Meiki in view of Toshiba, and further in view of Machida (US 6,718,378; hereafter "Machida").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for the reason presented below.

I. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

In the Office Action, claim 28 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection and, therefore, respectfully traverse the same. The Office Action states that the specification does not adequately describe the functionality of the "screen setting button" and what it is used for (page 2, lines 12-13). However, as an example of the claimed screen setting button, the specification clearly describes a screen setting button 28 as follows:

The screen setting button 28 in the ID/password setting screen 22 is touched to display a window 43. In the window 43, which of screens can be used by the registrant to select the setting permission state or setting inhibition state is set.
(Page 17, Line 27 – Page 18, Line 4)

As such, the specification clearly describes that the functionality of the screen setting button 28 is to provide a means for user selection by being touched on the screen and what it is used

for is to open a window 43. The description of the specification is enough to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention. Thus, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 28.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1, 3, 5-10 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Meiki. Claim 7 has been canceled and the rejection of claim 7 is rendered moot. Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection of claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8-10 and 30 and, therefore, respectfully traverse the same.

Meiki discloses the flow of the processing which registers voice data ([0050]). Meiki discloses a voice recognition unit 2 that can recognize an operator's voiceprint and can specify an operator by the recognition result ([0054], [0055]). Meiki discloses, as a prior art, a controller of an injection molder which specifies an operator by a key input of an ID number to prevent a setting item from being changed by a person other than the specific operator to protect variable data such as molding conditions when a setting is selected by a touch panel ([0002]). Meiki discloses two input modes, the manual-input mode and the voice input mode [0030]). However, Meiki does not discuss a feature that the permission control portion requests confirmation upon selecting the setting inhibition state when the indication is operated by the registrant of the device, as recited in claim 1.

Thus, Meiki cannot anticipate claim 1. Claims 3, 5-6, 8-10 and 30 are not anticipated at least due to the dependency on claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8-10 and 30.

In addition, Meiki fails to disclose a fingerprint biometrical authentication recited in claim 30. The Office Action states that Meiki discloses a fingerprint biometrical authentication by pointing out the description of [0050], [0054] (page 5, lines 1-2 in the Office Action). However, the description of [0050], [0054] is about voiceprint, not fingerprint. Thus, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 30.

III. Rejection of claims 2, 11-19, 21-23 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 2, 11-19, 21-23 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Meiki in view of Toshiba. Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection and,

therefore, respectfully traverse the same. As discussed above, Meiki fails to disclose the feature that the permission control portion requests confirmation upon selecting the setting inhibition state when the indication is operated by the registrant of the device, as recited in claim 1.

Toshiba cannot cure the deficiency noted with respect to Meiki. Toshiba discloses an injection molding machine having a man machine interface section divided into two regions, a main screen area and a sub screen area ([0008]). Toshiba does not, however, discuss the indication for the setting inhibition state operated by the registrant of the device. Thus, the combination of Meiki and Toshiba fails to disclose or suggest the above feature recited in claim 1.

Also, the Applicant would like to point out that in a control device of an injection molder, it is unique that the combined feature of (1) the screen display is divided into at least two regions such that each of the two regions display information to the registrant of the device to control the injection molder and (2) the display portion displays an indication for the setting inhibition state on the screen display. The combination realizes an secure and efficient injection molder control. The combination of Meiki and Toshiba does not teach or suggest the combined feature of (1) and (2).

Thus, claim 1 is patentable over the references. Claims 2, 11-19, 21-23 and 27 are patentable at least due to the dependency on claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 11-19, 21-23 and 27.

In addition, claim 22 depends on claim 20 that is not rejected over Meiki in view of Toshiba. Since this appears to be a simple mistake of the Office Action, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 22.

IV. Rejection of claims 4, 20 and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 4, 20 and 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Meiki in view of Fogle. Claim 4 has been canceled and thus the rejection of claim 4 is rendered moot. Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection of claims 20 and 24-26 and, therefore, respectfully traverse the same.

Fogle discloses a computer system having a lock mode activated by user action such as depressing a dedicated button, mouse button clicks, etc. ([0031]). Fogle discloses a way to unlock the computer by pressing a button and entering a valid password or satisfying other security validation scheme ([0044]). The Office Action indicates that the motivation to modify Meiki with Fogle is as follows:

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Meiki with Fogle et al. since Fogle et al. teaches that a lock button and an unlock button can prevent unauthorized users from accessing information on the computer.

(Page 6, Lines 18-21, emphasis added).

However, Fogle is directed to a computer system with improved entry into power-save and lock modes (title of the invention) and neither discusses nor suggests prohibiting the operation condition setting portion from outputting the setting of the at least one operating condition of the injection molder. Thus, Fogle cannot cure the deficiency noted with respect to Meiki.

The combination of Meiki and Fogle at least fails to disclose or suggest a combined feature of a permission control portion configured with at least two internal states including a setting inhibition state that prohibits the operation condition setting portion from outputting the setting of the at least one operating condition of the injection molder, wherein the permission control portion requests confirmation upon selecting the setting inhibition state when the indication is operated by the registrant of the device, as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, Meiki discloses registering voice data and recognizing an operator's voiceprint ([0050], [0054]) which teaches away from adopting a locking function in Fogle to prevent an unauthorized use by other people.

Also, the Applicant would like to point out that in a control device of an injection molder, it is unique that the combined feature of (1) the screen display is divided into at least two regions such that each of the two regions display information to the registrant of the device to control the injection molder and (2) the display portion displays an indication for the setting inhibition state on the screen display. The combination realizes an secure and efficient injection molder control. The combination of Meiki and Fogle does not teach or suggest the combined feature of (1) and (2).

Thus, claim 1 is patentable over the references. Claims 20 and 24-26 are patentable at least due to the dependency on claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 20 and 24-26.

V. Rejection of claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claim 29, which ultimately depends from claim 1, was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Meiki in view of Toshiba, and further in view of Machida. As shown above, neither Meiki nor Toshiba disclose or suggest the above permission control feature of claim 1 and Machida cannot cure the deficiency. Machida discusses a setting log screen (Fig. 47), but does not discuss the above feature.

Also, the Applicant would like to point out that in a control device of an injection molder, it is unique that the combined feature of (1) the screen display is divided into at least two regions such that each of the two regions display information to the registrant of the device to control the injection molder and (2) the display portion displays an indication for the setting inhibition state on the screen display. The combination realizes an secure and efficient injection molder control. The combination of Meiki, Toshiba and Machida does not teach or suggest the combined feature of (1) and (2).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 29.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims, and pass this application quickly to issue.

If there are any fees due for entry of this submission that are not otherwise accounted for, Applicant asks that any such fees be charged to our Deposit Account No. 03-3975, with reference to Order No. 008312/0306572.

Respectfully submitted,
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP



E. RICO HERNANDEZ
Reg. No. 47641
Tel. No. (703) 905-2088
Fax No. (703) 905-2500

ERH/YO
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 905-2000
Customer No. 00909